



# **SUSTAINING BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION IN AND AROUND NYUNGWE NATIONAL PARK (NNP)**

**Associate Cooperative Agreement N° Aid-696-La-10-00001 under Leader  
Cooperative Agreement N° Eem-A-00-09-00007-00**

**EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REVENUE  
SHARING PROGRAM AROUND NYUNGWE NATIONAL  
PARK, RWANDA**

May, 2012

# **EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM AROUND NYUNGWE NATIONAL PARK, RWANDA**

**Fidele Ruzigandekwe**

**May 2012**

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS**

ANICO:	Animateurs de Conservation
CBOs:	Community Based Organisations
CSOs:	Civil Society Organisations
GOs:	Governmental Organisations
GVTC:	Greater Virunga Transboundary Collaboration
JAF:	Joint Action Forum
M&E Plan:	Monitoring & Evaluation Plan
NGOs:	Non Governmental Organisations
NNP:	Nyungwe National Park
ORTPN:	Rwanda Office of Tourism and National Parks (currently a Department of Rwanda Development Board)
PA:	Protected Areas
RBM:	Ranger Based Monitoring
RDB:	Rwanda Development Board
RS:	Revenue Sharing
USAID:	US Agency for International Development
WCS:	Wildlife Conservation Society

# EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM AROUND NYUNGWE NATIONAL PARK, RWANDA

## I. Executive Summary

Protected areas share a variety of benefits with local communities, acting as reservoir of natural products (water, plant and animal species which disperse out of the parks), providing environmental services (rainfall and climate regulation), often preserving cultural and spiritual values, generating



Figure 1: Managing PA in a human dominated landscape is challenging: RS is perceived as an efficient tool

opportunities from conservation projects as well as revenues from tourism activities. As such, tourism revenue sharing is just one of the types of benefits that are shared with local communities. According to a study carried out around Virunga, Volcano and Bwindi national parks (Plumptre et al. 2004), the value of the continued conservation of these forests outweighs the overall costs. However, much of the value of these forests is accrued at the national and international levels, while at the local level there often seems to be a net loss. Revenue Sharing is meant to promote a more equitable sharing of the costs and benefits of conservation. However it must be distributed in a fair and transparent way in order to benefit the people most affected by the costs and restriction of living adjacent to the parks.

Since 2005, the Government of Rwanda, through the then Rwanda Office of Tourism and National Parks (ORTPN), has adopted the “Provisional Policy & Guidelines for Tourism Revenue Sharing in Rwanda” and started the implementation of Tourism Revenue Sharing as a priority program in order to:

- reduce demand for protected areas’ resources by promoting alternative sources of materials and income;

- generate goodwill/trust by investing in projects that address local communities’ priority needs;

- act as a direct incentive for conservation by providing a

long-term flow of benefits, from protected areas to communities, which are contingent on local support for conservation, thereby providing a direct and strong link to the parks.

The rationale behind Revenue Sharing is that communities around national parks should derive direct benefits from the park, providing an enabling environment for good community relationships and in

support of park management authorities and regulations, despite the fact that they experience problems such as crop raiding, resource use restrictions.

As stipulated in the RS Provisional Policy & Guidelines, the overall Goal of Revenue Sharing is “To ensure sustainable conservation of the National Parks with the participation of the neighboring communities by contributing to the improvement of living conditions”

Also, three types of specific objectives are defined for the RS programme:

1. Conservation impact objectives:

- To reduce illegal activities
- To ensure sustainable conservation
- To increase community responsibility for conservation

2. Livelihoods impact objectives:

- To improve livelihoods by contributing to poverty reduction
- To compensate for loss of access and/or crop damage
- To provide alternatives to park resources
- To encourage community based tour

3. Relationship impact objectives (between park and population)

- To build trust
- To increase ownership
- To reduce conflicts
- To increase participation in conservation
- To empower communities

The Provisional Policy and Guidelines for RS in Rwanda provides also for the review and regular evaluations of the implementation of the RS program, to provide RDB with suggestions for modification of the policy and improvements in implementation procedures. It is in this regards that WCS has commissioned this evaluation, under the current USAID grant “Sustaining Biodiversity Conservation in and around Nyungwe National Park”. Within this project, there is an important component of biodiversity threats monitoring. As many threats come from neighboring communities, it is important to evaluate how RS schemes impact on conservation, local livelihoods and relationships between the park managers and the communities.

The objective of this review is to carry out a consultative study to assist RDB and stakeholders around Nyungwe National Park to assess the performance of the Revenue Sharing implementation during the period between 2005 and 2011 and identify adaptations required to increase its effectiveness and efficiency in compliance with agreed policy guidelines and taking into account updated stakeholders feedback.

This report presents the results of a study jointly undertaken by RDB, WCS with the USAID funding. The major outcome of this study indicates that the Revenue Sharing is slightly being diverted from its primary goal of being a conservation tool to become a mere source of funding for community projects

for social and livelihood development. In that sense, RS almost seems to be used as a tool for RDB corporate social responsibility to improve its branding image.

The other important aspect emerging from this study is that RS as conservation tool has not been well understood by the different stakeholders, especially the beneficiaries. Thus, there seems to be a lost opportunity to have the RS playing the role of raising awareness about the benefits of preserving the park, also in terms of increased socio economic development opportunities for the communities living adjacent to it.

The study concludes with a number of key recommendations to RDB and other stakeholders aiming at redirecting the RS program to its initial concept and strategic objectives. These recommendations should help devise a set of clear criteria that will guide the implementation and governance of the RS as a tool to ensure sustainable future conservation of Rwanda's National Parks in general and Nyungwe NP in particular.

## **II. Overview of the Revenue Sharing Principles and implementation in PA Management**

In recent times, the unethical basis of excluding local communities in matters concerning park management and using only traditional law enforcement practices has been recognized globally. As a result, many countries in Africa and elsewhere in the world have adopted community conservation initiatives in relation to management of protected areas and other natural resources.

Community conservation is concerned with involving local people in conservation, based on the principle that local people should participate in, benefit from, and take joint responsibility for the conservation of natural resources and protected areas. This approach stems from the recognition that the sustainability of protected areas in developing countries is very much affected by their ability to address the concerns of their human neighbors.

The sharing of benefits with local communities is one of the community conservation tools through which community-park relations can be improved. The concept of benefit sharing became more significant when the Convention for Biodiversity (CBD) was developed and approved in 1992. This international convention included three objectives – one of these three was the *“fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources”*. The CBD programme of work for protected areas (2004) went further than this and agreed to: *“establish by 2008 mechanisms for the equitable sharing of both costs and benefits arising out of the establishment and management of protected areas.”*

Benefit sharing programmes allow access to park resources, which may consist of natural resources that can be sustainably harvested, such as water and other natural products, as well as a share of parks’ financial revenue earned through tourism or other activities. Therefore, revenue is just one of the benefits that can be shared with local communities. It is an investment in conservation and it must demonstrate a favourable conservation impact. In addition to the practical argument that revenue sharing is an effective conservation strategy, there is also a moral argument that revenue sharing is required as a form of compensation for people that may be negatively impacted by living next to the park. In fact, while protected areas in general provide a number of benefits at local level to surrounding communities (such as rainfall and climate control, water catchments, prevention of soil erosion, tourism-related income, aesthetic benefits, and biodiversity conservation), communities also face costs from the proximity of national parks. These are mainly due to crop raiding and other problem animals, but also attack by wild animals with risk of injury, and what is called the *“opportunity cost”* (perceived cost of the loss of opportunity to fully exploit the natural resources in protected areas).

## **III. Background for Revenue Sharing Program in Rwanda**

The protected areas of Rwanda were all established a long time ago - Parc National des Volcans (PNV) was created in 1925, Parc National de l’Akagera (PNA) in 1934 and Nyungwe was initially gazetted as Forest Reserve in 1933, and became a National Park in 2005. During colonial times, like most African countries, Rwanda adopted the model of strict exclusionary protected areas, a practice which was carried on even after independence.

Rwanda is an agricultural country and more than 90% of the population relies on agricultural activity and depends on natural resources for firewood, water, medicinal plants and other non-timber products (i.e.

honey). As a result of human pressure on natural resources, and the need for agricultural land, the total area of Rwanda's parks has been reduced by more than 50% over the last 50 years (ORTPN, 2004).

The main threats currently faced by Rwanda's national parks are: poaching, firewood collection, illegal fishing, collection of medicinal plants and other non timber forest products, livestock grazing, fires, lack of buffer zone, encroachment, water collection, beekeeping, and potential de-gazettement. Most of these threats originate in areas bordering the parks and therefore both practical and moral arguments suggest that benefit sharing programmes must be focused on people living near the parks and particularly the poorer households that are more dependent on (illegal) use of resources and more seriously hit by any negative impacts (costs).

The RS program started in Rwanda in 2004, initially as a mere program to distribute some funds aiming at supporting community projects at the same time improving the relationship between the parks and its surrounding communities. This was felt as an original initiative and was meant to continue in the future as an important conservation tool to ensure sustainable preservation of Rwanda's national parks. However a need to have a set of guiding principles for the smooth and transparent implementation of the RS programme in Rwanda has soon emerged. It is in that regard that ORTPN commissioned in 2005 a study aiming at setting up the RS Guidelines. The document of Provisional Policy and Guidelines for RS in Rwanda describes the overall Goal of Revenue Sharing as: "To ensure sustainable conservation of the National Parks with the participation of the neighbouring communities by contributing to the improvement of living conditions". Also, three types of specific objectives are defined for the RS programme: (1) Conservation impact objectives; (2) Livelihoods impact objectives; and (3) Relationship impact objectives (between park and population)

The document mentions also that the RS is defined by a number of guiding principles that are seen as complementary to the goal and objectives, focusing on the way in which revenue sharing is implemented:

- **Programme identity:** to achieve its conservation goals, revenue sharing must be seen as a programme of RDB, and funding from the programme must be recognised by recipients as having been sourced from / donated by the protected areas.
- **Partnership with local government:** revenue sharing should be implemented with the full and active involvement of local government, and in a manner that is consistent with, and complementary to, the development plans and activities of local government.
- **Community participation:** park adjacent communities that are the primary target of the revenue sharing programme should be empowered to effectively participate in management of the revenue sharing programme and its key decision-making processes.
- **Complementarity:** Revenue sharing funds may provide co-funding alongside other sources of funding provided by government or other donors.
- **Additionality:** Revenue sharing funds must be additional to other sources of funding so that they provide park-adjacent communities with additional benefits, in recognition of costs of conservation that they experience.
- **Visibility:** When co-funding projects with other donors, the revenue sharing funds must retain their identity so that the benefits from the park are visible.
- **Transparency:** information on project selection, financial transactions and impact should be freely available.
- **Accountability:** roles, rights and responsibilities/obligations must be clearly defined, and ORTPN, local governments and local communities held accountable for fulfilling their respective obligations/responsibilities.

- **Sustainability:** if revenue sharing is to be more than a political gesture partners in the programme, including local communities, must see it as a long term commitment (subject to the continued availability of tourism revenues).

Furthermore a number of underlying policy elements / provisions help to provide direction to RS implementation, they include:

- Amount to be shared: Initially this has been decided (and remained up to now) as a percentage of 5% of Total Gross Revenue ("*Recettes*") earned in each park;
- Distribution between the parks : Income is to be combined into a national pool and distributed to the parks in a 40% PNV: 30% PNA: 30% PNN ratio;
- Target area – Influence zone: "Zone of Influence" for each park, initially defined as the sectors bordering the park, with further re-definition at each park after district and sector boundaries realignment in 2006;
- Distribution of projects around individual park: Selection processes to ensure a spread of funding among all target communities over time;
- Decision making authority for RS projects: Park Revenue Sharing Committee (PRSC) with input / initial screening from Community Development Committee at District level;
- Target beneficiaries: Poorer and more disadvantaged groups;
- Selection criteria for RS projects: A number of criteria for project funding are listed in this section.

#### IV. RS Evaluation around NNP

The overall objective for this evaluation is to carry out a consultative study in order to assist RDB and other stakeholders around Nyungwe, to assess the performance of the RS implementation during 2005-2011 and identify adaptations required to increase its effectiveness and efficiency in compliance with agreed policy guidelines and taking into account updated stakeholders feedback.

The study is jointly undertaken by RDB and WCS and is funded by USAID through the “Sustaining Biodiversity Conservation in and around NNP” Project. While RDB has commissioned a parallel study covering the rest of the National parks and with the financial support of the Greater Virunga Transboundary Collaboration (GVTC) Secretariate, the particularity of the present study is the latitude to dig out the specificities of the RS program in NNP in order to highlight the key findings and complement the GVTC led study. While it is understood that this study is specific to NNP, however its key recommendations can be easily applied to the whole RS program of Rwanda, covering the three national parks.

##### IV. 1. Methodologies for RS evaluation in NNP

In order to assess the effectiveness of the RDB’s RS program we used two approaches. , We first of all analyzed the existing documentation provided by RDB’s Community Conservation Department, including



Figure 2: Discussion with RS beneficiaries in Bweyeye Sector, Rusizi District

the list and other relevant data related to the implemented RS projects in NNP for the period 2005-2011 (see annex A). Secondly we conducted field visit at selected five projects sites around NNP (one project per District) and carried out some focus group discussions and interviews with representatives of those projects’ beneficiaries as well as the local authorities (Members of sector councils). In total ten focus groups interviews were performed.

The projects sites visited were selected by RDB Community Conservation staff who were also present during the interviews. For these interviews, we used a number of key questions (see annex b) to stimulate our interviewees in sharing their views and opinions and also have extensive discussion about the implementation of the RS program in NNP. The projects visited are:

- Construction of tile factory in Mutuntu Sector, Karongi District

- Maternity ward in Bweyeye Sector, Rusizi Distict
- Construction of Maize Grinding Factory in Buruhukiro Sector, District of Nyamagabe
- Construction of Tile Factory in Rangiro, Nyamasheke District
- Support to KAUKI Beekeeping Cooperative, Kivu Sector, District of Nyaruguru

The results of the visits and subsequent interviews were compiled, analyzed and are presented in the following section.

## IV.2. Key Findings of RS Evaluation

### IV.2.1. Desk review of RS documentation

Since its inception in 2005, a total amount of **RWF 1 041 727 212 (1 664 289 \$)** has been disbursed so far (2011) by RDB to support 158 community projects disseminated around the three national parks of Rwanda. Among these, 41 supported projects are located in Nyungwe area, totalizing the amount of RWF 295 779 026, equivalent to 28.4% of the total disbursement by RDB.

The breakdown of the NNP RS projects is as follows:

- |                            |             |                               |               |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| • Infrastructure projects: | 31 projects | Value: <b>RWF 246 252 026</b> | <b>(83%)</b>  |
| • Agriculture projects:    | 6 projects  | Value: <b>RWF 28 260 000</b>  | <b>(9.6%)</b> |
| • Equipment supply:        | 2 projects  | Value: <b>RWF 11 167 000</b>  | <b>(3.8%)</b> |
| • Sensitization:           | 1 project   | Value: <b>RWF 10 000 000</b>  | <b>(3.4%)</b> |



**Figure 3: Construction of tile factory in Mutuntu Sector, Karongi District - RS on going project**

The bulk of the RS support has been directed toward infrastructure related projects (construction of schools, health centers, tile factory, maize grinding factory etc. According to RDB the reason for heavy investment in infrastructures is that infrastructure projects are more visible, much easier to implement and to follow up and are responding to the needs presented by the beneficiaries. Only one project related to education / sensitization (supporting a cultural troupe) was implemented.

Provisional Guidelines and Policy Document is presented below:

A general view with regard to the expected impacts as prescribed in the RS

- a. Conservation impact objectives: to reduce illegal activities, to ensure sustainable conservation, and to increase community responsibility for conservation

Our assessment revealed that there was no direct link found between the implemented (infrastructure) projects with the objective of the conservation of the park. There was no noticed reduction of illegal activities in the park that could be attributable to RS implemented projects (Figure 1) and no measured increased community responsibility as result of RS implemented project. Although communities do participate in fire fighting activities, this participation could not be directly related to the RS projects as they are very often forced by law enforcement officers and local authorities to intervene when fires occur.

The map below shows that many illegal activities (especially mining, fire incidences etc.) still occur inside the park, in parts close to sectors in which some RS projects have been performed.



Figure 4: Distribution of Revenue Sharing projects and encounter rates of illegal activities in NNP

- b. Livelihoods impact objectives: to improve livelihoods by contributing to poverty reduction, to compensate for loss of access and/or crop damage, to provide alternatives to park resources, and to encourage community based tourism

While investments in infrastructure projects do contribute to social development and increased welfare of neighboring communities in general (through education and improved health services) these projects do not however directly address the livelihood and poverty alleviation issues. This analysis demonstrate that RS is not targeted to the poorest of the poor and affected by crop raiding by wildlife from the park. It should also be clear that some of these individuals do not send their children to school and cannot afford the health care. It has also be noted that no RS implemented project is specifically related to encourage initiatives related to community based tourism.

- c. Relationship impact objectives (between park and population): to build trust, to increase ownership, to reduce conflicts, to increase participation in conservation; and to empower communities

It was difficult to measure the contribution of RS in building positive relationship between the communities and the park. However there was a perception that that RS contributed to build some sort of trust between beneficiaries and park; although there was no indication that the conflicts park-people have reduced due to RS implemented projects; as well as a sense of community empowerment as result of RS implemented projects.

The general attitude towards conservation in Nyungwe National Park is positive as highlighted in a recent attitude, knowledge and behavior survey carried out in 2011 (WCS 2011). This is due to sensitization campaigns and job opportunities offered by the park (park management, lodges and etc.). Considering the fact that areas that have received much support from RS are areas with high illegal activities one would say that the impact of RS in building relationship is minimal

In terms of RS awareness, the general perception is that the public does not fully understand the RS and its triple objectives: instead RS has been confounded with the so called “corporate social responsibility” program of RDB: a way of giving back to communities from the revenues so as to build a positive image (philanthropic way) among the communities. While this as such may not be a negative thing, the drawback is that this corporate action of giving away a portion of its revenues is seldom associated with the RDB conservation mandate in order to raise greater support for the conservation of NNP.

Some of the local authorities themselves do not understand the RS concept, its goals / objectives. This was compounded by the apparent weaknesses (from RDB) in ensuring the proper image of RS and assist in delivering to its objectives. This resulted in RS being taken over / transformed into some form of additional funding source offered to local administration, to use in supporting them to deliver on some government priorities (fighting against thatched houses “nyakatsi”, 9 Year Basic Education etc.) and in that way, helping local administration achieving their performance contracts (imihigo) without a clear idea of what districts should contribute in return.

The Beneficiaries themselves are not fully aware of the RS as an opportunity for socio economic development as well as welfare improvement: this resulted into the low participation of local communities in RS overall implementation.

## IV.2. 2. Nyungwe beneficiaries' opinions on RS

### A. General knowledge of RS program

The general perception is that overall the public does not fully understand the RS and its triple objectives. Instead RS has been confounded with the so called “corporate social responsibility” program of RDB: a way of giving back to communities from the revenues so as to build a positive image (philanthropic way) among the communities. As such this is not bad at all, the only drawback is that this corporate action of giving away a portion of its revenues is seldom associated with the RDB conservation mandate in order to raise greater support for the conservation of NNP.



Figure 5: RS Group discussion: Ruharambuga Sector, Nyamagabe District

Among local authorities themselves, several do not understand the RS concept, its goals / objectives. This was compounded by the apparent weaknesses (from RDB part) in ensuring the proper image of RS and insisting on delivering on its objectives. This resulted in RS being taken over / transformed into some form of additional funding source offered to local administration, to be used in supporting them to deliver on some government priorities (fighting against thatched houses “nyakatsi”, 9Year Basic Education etc.) and in that way, helping local administration achieving their performance contracts (imihigo), while the conservation related message is indeed absent.

Similarly, most of beneficiaries are not fully aware of the RS as an opportunity for socio economic development as well as welfare improvement: this resulted into the low participation of local communities in RS overall implementation.

### B. Understanding the source of the mandate for Sharing Revenue

Many people do know where the mandate for RS comes from; however, some individuals believe that RS is one of RDB’s programmes aiming at raising the awareness for the conservation of the park among

the surrounding communities, so that they gain more ownership and engagement in its long term preservation. Park managers know about the RS Guidelines elaborated in 2005, but pointed out that this document still lacks strength of the law. They suggested the RS guidelines be quickly formally adopted and be translated into a national policy and legal framework.

### C. Understanding of how RS program works

Some of the beneficiaries have got an idea of the process for RS project selection. They reported that they prepare project proposal and pass it on to Sector (Agronome of the sector) who assesses the relevance of the project with regard to social and conservation impacts; the agronome transmits the proposal to the District (responsible of cooperatives) who also assesses it and will table that proposal during the RS Committee meeting, in which RDB representative are naturally present. A decision on the funding of project is then taken by consensus. However some community members complained that communities are not informed regularly about the selection process and even the outcome / decision on projects funded; but they know that the process involves a tough competition due to the limited amount available for RS projects. Moreover they pointed out that although the district leaders are the ones in charge of promoting and defending the projects during the RS project selection, unfortunately they don't necessarily always know the projects enough well so they don't do a good job of that. In order to assess each project's potential impact, RDB would need to go to the field to see the conditions, meet the project developers and see the problems for themselves.

The park managers pointed out that although RS program is embedded in RDB conservation program, it nevertheless is currently deviated from its primary intended goal of supporting conservation, and is increasingly used as tool for corporate social responsibility (leaving out the primary objective of supporting conservation of the parks). The tendency now is to give out a fixed amount of the money (an annual envelope) to each district sharing borders with any of the NPs, and these districts have all the responsibility to use that money for whatever good intentions / projects they have, which might even have no conservation relevance. On top of that these projects might not necessarily fulfill the project criteria in accordance to the RS Guidelines; the reason for this is that RDB is concerned with the



accountability in using the public funds and hence is expected the local authorities at the district level to take up those responsibilities and follow the existing procedures in the usage and disbursement of government funds. The question now is to know the future roles of and relevance of the Park RS Committee, which in the past used to be accountable for the selection and monitoring of the RS supported projects. , RS is becoming an easy source of funds for districts to source out funding for priority / development programs which do not necessarily

**Figure 6: RS scheme was used to support other government development program such as improving rural houses (fight against 'nyakatsi')**

have a direct/indirect impact on park conservation, the argument being that this is after all, government money, so it can be used wherever it is most needed. - For example RS funds have been used to support some other governments programs such as the construction of the school halls for the nine year basic education program and the construction of houses for poor communities as way of fighting against thatched and indecent houses (Nyakatsi). However, these activities would likely have been supported by other government funds. Indeed, this is contrary to one of the RS guideline which stipulates that RS is not meant to replace other government social development programs and its prime objective should rather be to support conservation.

#### **D. Regularity of RS funding**

Most of the stakeholders that were interviewed know that the funding cycle for RS projects is annual basis. Unfortunately all the projects presented each year do not get funded; it is a tough competition, while a small number of projects presented in the previous round get additional support. In the eyes of many stakeholders, this raises the question of the transparency of the project selection process.

#### **E. Decision making for RS distribution**

At the beginning of each year, it is RDB's prerogative to inform the beneficiaries / districts about the RS program and the amount to be shared so that they prepare proposals. The amount shared is calculated out of the revenues of the previous year and is provided into the budget of the actual year. The amount is decided during the RDB's annual budget preparation. However, the process of allocating the amount to each project is becoming less rigorous as most of the responsibilities are being delegated to the districts. The risk in that is to even further distance the RS program from its intended impacts on conservation, because there is no guarantee that the districts will follow the set criteria in the selection of projects to be supported by the RS program.

#### **F. Amount of RS so far implemented in different areas**

There was the feeling that some districts and sectors get more projects funded than others. Due to perceived limited transparency in the selection process, it is not clear why some projects were accepted and others were rejected and also no feedback is usually provided for the rejected projects (case of livestock and women tourism handicraft development). An additional problem in the current system seems to lie in the fact that district leaders are those appointed to promote projects. Unfortunately, they are often not in the position to adequately present these projects as they often do not necessarily know or understand the details of such projects. Thus, RDB needs to come to the field to see the conditions and meet the project developer and see the problems for themselves.

Interviewees raised also the question of equity in the distribution of the RS projects in different areas. Some areas have received more support than others, while every effort should be made so that beneficiaries are equally treated.

The level of the delivery on the initiated projects was discussed: some projects did never start although the money had been delivered, others were executed to a certain level but were not completed, while others were delayed in execution for various reasons. It was remarked that a Monitoring and Evaluation

System to follow up on the execution of the various project is lacking, and RDB should make an effort to set up such a system which will serve both the funder (RDB) as well as the beneficiaries themselves.

#### **G. Understanding of RS selection criteria**

Many of the stakeholders interviewed are not fully aware of the criteria used in the selection of the projects to be supported by RS program. Some of the districts authorities admitted that they support /promote projects that are in line with their performance contract (both at sector and district levels), others recognize that they take also into account the needs / requirements for a better protection of the park.

RDB sustain that they have at every occasion explained the criteria for RS project selection, which are: (1) project feasibility; (2) project sustainability and impacts; (3) distance/ proximity to the national park; (4) positive and tangible impact on conservation; (5) participation of project beneficiaries; (6) demonstrable benefits to the local population; (7) integration with RDB and district development plans; (8) size of the project. A general training on RS program with emphasis on project selection criteria is required for RS stakeholders, especially the local authorities.

#### **H. Understanding of decision process for RS project selection**

Most of the interviewed stakeholders are aware of the RS Committee that is involved in the decision making process regarding the allocation of funds to the projects. As per the park managers interviewed, this Committee is composed of : (1) Park wardens – Chief Park Warden and Community Conservation Warden; (2) district representative; (3) park partners – NGOs representatives; (4) Local representatives from target area / beneficiaries. However, some beneficiaries complained that they are not present during these meetings, so that they could better provide required explanation than their sector authorities who do not necessarily understand the relevance and meaning of the presented projects.

#### **I. Relevance of selected RS projects**

On this question, interviewed stakeholders voiced different opinions: some think that the right projects are selected, because these projects need to pass through a series of checks at different levels (from communities to district through the sector before being selected by consensus in RDB's RS led meeting; however others expressed their personal wish to have more transparency in the project selection process.

Moreover, some individuals think that big infrastructure projects are not so helpful for conservation because people don't associate them with the park—they are too indirect. They would like smaller projects that address local people's concerns. For instance, they would like to see more projects addressing the crop raiding issues which continue to hamper the relationship between the park and the surrounding communities. On the other hand, people would be interested in a project which would allow them to clear ferns in the park for domestic use as well as an opportunity for employment and gaining some revenues.

As the project selection process is now passing over to the districts, fear is that rigor and transparency will be neglected, which would open even more vices such as corruption...

#### **J. Amount of money distributed / how is it managed**

Substantial amount of money has been distributed to support RS program: 41 supported projects are located in Nyungwe area, totalizing the amount of RWF 295 779 026, equivalent to 28.4% of the total disbursement by RDB for the 2005-2011 period. The districts have been increasingly involved in the management of these funds (as they are legally accountable for the management of such public funds). It appears that some have done it well, some have not... This has caused delays and other flaws in the progress and completion of the various projects. Moreover, the lack of a strong performance monitoring & evaluation system for RS projects has made the matter even worse, with some beneficiaries complaining of not having been informed about the process of the management of these funds, and yet they feel these are theirs as they are meant to support their own projects... Clearly more transparency is needed from the districts.

#### **K. Understanding of the shared percentage**

Many people are not aware of the percentage or/and of which revenues are shared. This is pertinent to the lack of general awareness about RS in general. In this, they were not able to distinguish the RS support from other sources of funding for social development, being governmental or other partners (NGO, projects etc). Additionally, some people who pretended to be a bit more informed reported that the money distributed come from fines for illegal activities that RDB had collected over years!

#### **L. Awareness of RS among the general public (including the project beneficiaries)**

Several members of communities interviewed do not identify themselves with the RS project they are supposed to benefit from. They believe that such projects are usually the idea of a few “enlightened” community fellows. They, however understand the concept of cooperative, but claim not having enough technical capacity, wishing to gain more knowledge on cooperative management, business planning, etc. On the other hand, some people think that the projects should target the poorest among the communities, as they are most vulnerable and depend mostly on the park resources for their survival. Instead of basing the project proposals on the district/sector priorities, some beneficiaries requested that the proposals should mirror their claims and needs. Preference would be given to projects that are geared toward rural development, that generate benefit for communities in terms of direct income, employment and access to basic services. More specifically, people claimed that there is urgent need to have a system that prevents crop raiding by the park’s primates as this is a serious issue that needs to be looked at urgently, and this could be among key priority projects that should be supported by the RS program.

#### **M. Real benefits originating from the RS projects as perceived by the beneficiaries**

Some of the interviewed beneficiaries admitted that RS-funded projects do contribute to increase the community welfare in general, even when these projects do not necessarily take into account individual benefits. In most of the cases, a less significant fraction of surrounding community do benefit from RS, in a way or another (ranging from some to reasonable benefits). In particular, there is it is important to ensure that the needs of poorest of the poor are taken into consideration by the RS program, as the latter are the most affected by strict park regulations and also themselves may affect park protection.

**N. RS and conservation attitude / behavior change**

The general opinion is that the benefits are still meager to warrant behavior change from hostile to friendlier attitude toward the park. The program is still in its infancy, it has not yet affected many among the communities living around NNP, therefore its benefits are not yet significant to affect livelihood and also help changing the community attitude and behaviors toward more engagement in conservation.

**O. RS to offset the disadvantages of living in proximity with the park**

Some RS beneficiaries admitted that RS would one day offset the disadvantages of living in the proximity with the park (once for example beekeeping becomes a more lucrative activity than agriculture) However many other people still look at the park as source of problem, especially due to the crop raiding issues which affect the communities bordering the park. People hope that RS could help addressing such a problem and should do it as quickly as possible.

## **V. Analysis of Findings and Recommendations**

### **V.1. Assess the type and nature of projects being implemented under the RS arrangement and evaluate the relevance of such RS projects to conservation, local livelihoods and development**

In trying to assess the RS projects, it became evident that the majority of the supported projects have more relevance to development in general but less on local livelihoods and minor to null bearing positive impact on conservation itself. This is of major concern, given that the RS was initially conceived as a conservation tool, not a development tool. This concern will even grow bigger if the current trend to devolve all the RS responsibilities to the districts continues.

- It is of paramount importance that RDB, in partnership with other stakeholders, come together to revisit the RS program and take appropriate measures to apply it as per the provisions described in the RS provisional Guidelines and Policy document.

### **V.2. Degree of relation between programme implementation process/projects and its identity as RDB/park related programme (refer to issues arising from Park Management Plan).**

Parallel to this, RS proposed projects rarely reflect any reference with the Park Management Plan; instead RS projects shifted from park to development focused issues (from park to district centered priorities; districts do not necessarily understand conservation nor do they have conservation related aspects and priorities in their plans): this results from the governance of RS (request projects from districts without clearly explained criteria, and discussion / prioritization of projects presented with no scientific manner and clear to everyone concerned).

- It is recommended that RS criteria be redefined and explained to all the stakeholders. RS as a conservation tool should address primarily issues related to park management as described into the Park General Management Plan.

### **V.3. Extent of participation by local government structures and complementarities with local development plans**

Through this assessment, it was noted that decentralized government structures have indeed participated in the RS program. However RS tends to be used as another source of funding for district initiatives, it however is most of the time used as adhoc source, and does not necessarily refer to the district development plans.

- The principle of complementarity for RS implementation needs to be revisited. RS cannot replace other governmental development programs under the responsibility of various government bodies. RS should complement these other programs, targeting mainly programs aiming at addressing issues related to the conservation of the park and affecting the livelihood of the neighboring communities.

### **V.4. Extent of participation of beneficiary communities in the identification of projects and their implementation and monitoring**

Theoretically, projects are proposed by communities and reflect their needs. They are selected through the CDC/cells or sectors' Njyanama and are prioritized at district level. However, things in practice are

different, as projects are often discussed by authorities without necessarily having secured the involvement of communities. Participation of community during projects' implementation is also questionable, unless in form of employment. Community contribution for the project implementation (as RS condition) is also not perceived and not guaranteed.

One of the major weaknesses for the RS implementation is the lack of a clear monitoring process to assess projects' implementation.

- The participation of the beneficiaries communities must be ensured at all level of RS project, from identification to selection as well as implementation.
- The role / contribution of the community being among the criteria for RS project selection needs to be clearly defined in project proposal and be monitored during the project implementation. This will ensure the real ownership of the project by the beneficiaries.

#### **V.5. Extent of participation of CSOs and NGOs/projects in the identification of projects and their implementation and monitoring, as well as provision of technical advice and institutional support**

During the assessment, it was noted that most of the projects have been proposed by administrative authorities. However a recent proposition has adopted for the local cooperatives/associations to submit projects for consideration by the RS committee. Being at lower close to the grassroots level, it is anticipated that the projects submitted by these CSOs have greater chance to consider needs of the poor among the communities (which was not necessarily the case initially).

With regard to the involvement of NGOs and CSOs into the RS program to provide technical advice & institutional backup, it was noted that this was often still not the case. Although some participation of NGOs / CSOs into the RS Committee at park level is recognized, it was felt that RS is still perceived as being purely government initiative, with very little involvement of other partners or non governmental bodies.

- There is a strong need to involve other partners (NGOs and CSOs) into the RS program, in order to contribute with advice and expertise in the strengthening of the program and to make it more transparent and accountable. This participation should also concern the need for technical capacity building and empowerment of the beneficiaries in project identification, implementation as well as management of impacts.

#### **V.6. Nature of the RS beneficiaries and an assessment of how the beneficiaries were selected**

Projects are submitted by sectors/cells committees and are selected through RS park committee in which districts and sectors representative are also present. However, beneficiaries expressed their wish to be part of the RS selection committee so as to ensure their voice is heard during the selection process. Moreover, some of the selected projects emerged from the district / sector priorities (as part of the district / sector performance contract – imihigo), and have indeed passed the selection process although they were not necessarily fulfilling the RS criteria/objectives...

- There is a need to review the RS selection process and make sure the RS criteria for project selection are well understood by all the stakeholders, especially the members of RS Selection Committee. For this, specific training sessions need to be regularly organized.

### **V.7. Extent of recognition given to PA related costs and affected parties in the selection of RS investments**

The RS assessment revealed that, when it comes to prioritizing location of projects, the PA related costs and affected parties were somehow recognized, but not in a systematic way, , as often there is no consideration whether the project will address the costs / issues of affected parties (like the case of crop raiding by park animals).

- This brings up again the issue of making sure that the RS program is fulfilling its objectives, and is making the intended impacts (thus the need to enforce the RS selection criteria).

### **V.8. Availability of information (what and for whom and how) on project selection, implementation, monitoring and related processes**

Most of information on projects is provided through project proposals written up by proponents. The latter provide additional info whenever needed. However, there is need for appropriate management of RS related information for monitoring purposes.

- Need to set up appropriate monitoring system for RS related files at RDB as well as district / beneficiaries levels

### **V.9. Extent of compliance with roles and responsibilities for concerned stakeholders foreseen in the policy guideline**

The roles and responsibilities are not well understood by the concerned stakeholders, as RS is still perceived as a government initiative, still posing a governance issue for its implementation.

- Organize capacity building / training sessions on RS for all the stakeholders to ensure that their roles and responsibilities are well understood

### **V.10. Extent of awareness of revenue sharing to the beneficiaries**

During this assessment it was discovered that the RS program is not well / extensively known; RS is mostly known to authorities as they see it as source of funds, although its objectives and expected outcomes do not seem to be sufficiently understood by everyone.

- Revenue sharing is clearly a strategy that needs to be reviewed at various levels, including how those benefits are publicized among the population.

### **V.11. Impact and sustainability of RS initiated interventions**

The present assessment did not specifically look into the impact and the sustainability of the RS supported interventions. These clearly need to be evaluated extensively. However it is generally recognized that the impact of RS projects are still limited (especially conservation impacts) as RS is not really sufficiently associated with park conservation, but is rather perceived as a tool for improving corporate image of ORTPN / RDB (a good will or philanthropist gesture to support socio economic development motivated by just a pulse to feel good that we have contributed to alleviate striking poverty around PA).

- RS needs to be rethought / reoriented so that it can really achieve its intended impacts (conservation, socio economic / livelihood and relationship)

#### **V.12. Key areas defined in the district plans and others CSO/NGOs/community plans supported by RS investment**

Most of the projects supported by RS are related to education (school infrastructure), health, water & sanitation, agriculture, housing and infrastructure development. These reflect mostly the priorities of the districts and sectors, which are indeed part of districts plans. However, communities did complain that while these projects are good in general, more is needed to reflect communities' livelihood concerns.

- Districts and their NGOs / CSOs partners should have NNP considerations in their plans. RS might be one source of funding to address park related concerns clearly identified in those plans.

#### **V.13. How the RS projects and processes are contributing to conservation threats reduction**

The RS assessment did not prove that there exists direct link of RS with the reduction of conservation threats.

- Revenue sharing, according to villagers, would target conservation better if they were smaller projects that people could directly see as coming from the park.
- It would be important to use RBM data to link RS intervention towards reducing conservation threats and achieve conservation impacts in that way.

## **VI. RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO RS GOVERNANCE**

### **Project formulation and screening**

It is recommended to initiate sensitization campaign for the RS stakeholders regarding the RS policy / guideline and its triple expected impacts. Equally important will be to set clear, transparent and complying criteria for project selection, devise mechanisms to apply the criteria transparently when screening the proposals and to secure the training of stakeholders in projects' formulation. Finally, it is paramount to formalize the mandate of the Park RS committee to implement a sound monitoring program to secure the effectiveness of the funded projects.

### **Appropriate levels of decision making**

Whenever feasible, projects proposals should be initiated from the grass root level (with approval from authorities) and addressing real issues at the ground, as district and sector levels are more constrained with many other priorities. Beneficiaries themselves should be part of the RS Committee (not only the representatives of the decentralized authorities). Communities should be empowered in the decision making process, with a special focus on trying to include in the decision making process the poor among communities, as they are mostly the ones that affect / are affected by park due to lack of alternatives. The RS program exists because of the park, therefore, the park should be central to this program. The park management should oversee the whole RS program and play an active role at the various levels of the RS process.

### **Disbursement and financial monitoring**

It is recommended to: set up appropriate criteria for disbursement and financial monitoring and apply them transparently; enforce monitoring of project implementation, with clear milestones to monitor against; provide disbursement upon performance in project implementation; and request recipients to keep account books, and make timely and regular checks and take appropriate action if necessary.

### **Project implementation mechanisms**

A clear project implementation plan must be part of each project proposal. It is also essential to set up a monitoring plan, regularly checked for adherence of beneficiaries by an effective monitoring committee.

### **Technical support required**

Training and empowering beneficiaries (especially those with less formal education, often from the poorest layers of the communities is needed, with technical support from other stakeholders and under RDB overall responsibility for RS implementation. More emphasis must be placed on project identification, in order to reflect the triple objectives of the RS. Finally, it is paramount to draw lessons from previous initiatives and build on the past realizations.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

Monitoring and Evaluation must be part of the whole process; Each project must have a monitoring plan, with clear milestones in the implementation phases, as part of contract between RDB and the beneficiaries. Regular reporting system with appropriate follow up action when required must be part of the whole process enforced by RDB, including a final evaluation report with key lessons highlighted. In addition, the RS program itself should also regularly be monitored and assessed (regular assessment and implement key subsequent recommendations; link the implementation of the RS with the RBM data, in order to target reduction of the conservation threats).

### **Public accountability**

Regular reporting on project progress should be made publicly available, in order to ensure accountability to the public. Additionally, in order to stimulate adherence of the public (and contribution) to the RS project, there needs to be adequate RS publicity (sign posting, brochures, flyers, programs on community radios...).

### **Feasible priorities for the next 4 years in the actions identified**

As an immediate action, it would be useful to compile a list of potential RS projects around NNP which might be updated regularly, and discuss the feasibility of these projects with the relevant stakeholders (having in mind the triple objectives of the RS). It is imperative to elaborate a comprehensive M&E plan for RS implementation, capturing different data on RS around NNP to help measuring impact of RS over time.

### **Collaborative, complementarity and coordination arrangements between partners (GOs/ NGOs/ CSOs/ projects)**

Identify collaborators / partners interested in RS implementation around NNP; identify areas of synergy / complementarities with collaborators; set up a RS platform / committee to steer RS implementation around NNP, under the coordination of RDB/NNP management; create collaboration agreement with partners for the implementation and monitoring of the RS-funded projects.

### **Identification of CSOs/NGOs or other mechanisms which might play a supporting role in capacity building, promotion of accountability, monitoring and public participation**

Identify partners who can build capacity for project identification, definition, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Use NNP JAF structure in RS promotion and to support RS implementation: NNP JAF should be a platform to lead RS implementation around PA. Link RS implementation with districts / sectoral imihigo (System of performance measuring mechanisms) Additional recommendations include: promote RS in different forums with communities, create a monitoring team for RS projects, ensure transparency in project selection process, officially launch/inaugurate RS completed projects to ensure adherence of public, and ensure that each RS implemented project is adequately monitored.

### **Preliminary organizational and capacity profile of local government institutions involved in the RS system implementation and in addressing PAs problems**

The local government institutions do not fully understand the RS program, there have been many regular changes in local authorities since RS started, but no sensitization/training has so far been done. Local authorities are not fully aware of the role they ought to play in securing park conservation as well as in RS implementation. In fact, in general it seems like they see it as another source of funding for their “imihigo”, with little time devoted to other RS aspects (“*this is park stuff, it does not have anything to do with us*!”). Also, in general RS is not perceived as a priority for local authorities because the money is not significant compared to other big projects – bigger priorities to attend to as part of their obligation /duties, limited capacity in getting involved in the PA / RS issues by local authorities.

**Support approaches that link the concept of RS with conservation and livelihood enterprises i.e. tourism, community conservation enterprises etc**

Make RS as basis for wealth creation through enterprise development related to tourism development and community conservation.

RS should support conservation & tourism related cooperatives (beekeeping, handcraft making, tourism...), ex-poachers associations, ANICO coop, mushroom growers etc..

## VII. Conclusions

The Revenue Sharing Review process has been carried out by WCS /RDB as part of the USAID supported project “Sustaining biodiversity conservation in and around NNP. The main objective of this review is to assess the performance of the Revenue Sharing implementation and identify adaptations required to increase its effectiveness and efficiency in compliance with the agreed policy guidelines taking into account updated stakeholders feedback.

This assessment was carried out by visiting selected five implemented Revenue Sharing Projects, and conducting interviews with several stakeholders to determine the expected impacts of these RS projects on both conservation, livelihoods as well as relationships between the park and the population. Consideration was also given to the actual implementation (governance) of the RS programme, including the RS organs, criteria for project selection, participation of beneficiaries and local authorities, monitoring & evaluation of RS projects, accountability, collaboration and partnership for the implementation of RS projects etc.

The main findings for the review include:

- There was no direct link found between the implemented projects with the objective of the conservation of the park; there was no noticed reduction of illegal activities in the park that could be attributable to RS implemented projects and no measured increased community responsibility as result of RS implemented project (communities do participate in fire fighting activities but this participation could not be directly related to the RS projects).
- Most of the RS implemented projects are infrastructure based, aiming at providing essential services to the concerned communities. Although they do contribute to social development and increased welfare in general, they however do not necessarily address the livelihood and poverty alleviation issues of those communities living closer to the park, nor do they address compensation issue for wildlife damaged crops. Additionally, no RS implemented project is specifically related to encouraging initiative related to community based tourism.
- It was difficult to measure the contribution of RS in building positive relationship between the communities and the park. Even if there was a perception that RS contributed to build some sort of trust between beneficiaries and park, there was no indication that the conflicts park-people have reduced due to RS implemented projects, nor that a sense of community empowerment as result of RS implemented projects was forged.
- In terms of RS awareness, the general perception is that the public does not fully understand the RS and its triple objectives: instead RS has been confounded with the so called “corporate social responsibility” program of RDB: a way of giving back to communities from the revenues so as to build a positive image (philanthropic way) among the communities. As such this is not per se negative, the only drawback is that this corporate action of giving away a portion of its revenues is seldom associated with the RDB conservation mandate in order to raise greater support for the conservation of NNP.

- Lack of understanding of RS goals / objectives and weaknesses (from RDB) in ensuring the proper image of RS and assist in delivering to its objectives resulted in RS being taken over / transformed into some form of additional funding source offered to local administration, to use in supporting them to deliver on some government priorities (fighting against thatched houses “nyakatsi”, Nine Year Basic Education etc.) and in that way, helping local administration achieving their performance contracts (imihigo).
- The Beneficiaries themselves are not, in the majority of cases, fully aware of the RS as an opportunity for socio economic development as well as welfare improvement: this results into the low participation of local communities in RS overall implementation.

Some key recommendations to improve RS implementation in NNP:

- Create general awareness of RS program in order to change the current perception of RS (for RS to be perceived primarily as a tool for conservation of NNP before it is for social development)
- Linking /tying the RS with improvement of conservation measures undertaken to reduce illegal activities in particular area (using RBM data)
- Improve on the governance and accountability at all levels: install basic but efficient structure for the implementation of RS program with a solid monitoring and evaluation component to increase the level of accountability
- Increase the capacity of the stakeholders for RS implementation to improve on RS project development (according to the set criteria), participation, empowerment and accountability
- Set up collaborative, complementarity and coordination arrangements between partners (GOs/ NGOs/ CSOs/ projects) interested in RS implementation around NNP.

## **Bibliography**

Catrine A. MacKenzie, 2012: Trenches like fences make good neighbours: Revenue sharing around Kibale National Park, Uganda. In *Journal of Nature Conservation – JNC- 25215*

David Mwesigye Tumusiime and Paul Vedeld, 2012: False Promise or False Premise? Using Tourism Revenue Sharing to Promote Conservation and Poverty Reduction in Uganda. In *Conservation and Society 10 (1): 15-28*

ORTPN, 2004: ORTPN 5 Year Strategic Plan 2004-2009

ORTPN, 2005: Tourism Revenue Sharing in Rwanda – Provisional Policy and Guidelines

Plumptre, A.J., Kayitare, A., Rainer, H., Gray, M., Munanura, I., Barakabuye, N., Asuma, S., Protected Areas in the Central Albertine Rift. *Albertine Rift Technical Reports, 4.* 127pp

Sivha, M., and Namara, A. (2004) The Socio-economic Status of People Living Near Wildlife Conservation Society, 2011: NNP Education and Outreach Baseline Survey Report

**Annexes**

**a. RDB List of implemented RS projects in NNP (2005-2010)**

<b>Project</b>	<b>year</b>	<b>Beneficiaries / districts</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Status</b>
Construction of Tile Factory in Twumba	2007	Karongi /Twumba	3 056 800	Infrastructure	Completed
Efficient stove construction	2006	Nyamagabe/ 5 sectors	5 000 000	Equipment	Pending
Fodder production	2007	Nyamagabe /Gatare	5 000 000	Agriculture	Completed
Maracouja growing & fodder production	2007	Nyamagabe / Nkomane	4 860 000	Agriculture	On going
Construction of APEKA School Hall (emergency after earthquake)	2008	Nyamasheke / Kagano	30 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Construction of Karambi School	2007	Nyamasheke / Karambi	3 951 250	Infrastructure	Completed
Construction of Ngange Health Center (Sanitation)	2008	Nyamasheke / Karambi	2 257 800	Infrastructure	Completed

Construction of Ngange Health Center	2007	Nyamasheke / Karambi	8 375 250	Infrastructure	Completed
Maracouja growing in Rangiro	2007	Nyamasheke / Rangiro	7 600 000	Agriculture	Completed
Rwabidege – Kanyinya Road Rehabilitation	2006	Nyamasheke / Ruharambuga	13 866 200	Infrastructure	Completed
Support Beekeeping development	2005	Nyaruguru / 4 Sectors	4 500 000	Agriculture	Completed
Water adduction development	2007	Nyaruguru / Kivu	8 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Construction of Dispensary in Gasumo	2005	Rusizi / Butare	11 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Construction of Maternity ward in Bweyeye	2007	Rusizi / Bweyeye	9 903 821	Infrastructure	Completed
Construction Matare District College	2008	Rusizi / Nkungu	10 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Construction Rususa School	2007	Rusizi / Nkungu	8 279 255	Infrastructure	Completed

Construction Rususa School (Emergency / reconstruction after earthquake)	2008	Rusizi / Nkungu	10 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Construction of tile factory in Mutuntu	2009	Karongi / Mutuntu	7 806 000	Infrastructure	On going
Construction of Tile Factory for Twitezimbere babumbyi Cooperative	2009	Nyamagabe / Gatere	2 335 533	Infrastructure	Completed
Support Community Tourism Cooperative "Friends of Nyungwe"	2009	Nyamagabe / Kitabi	10 000 000	Sensitization	On going
Construction of water tank at APEKA secondary school	2009	Nyamasheke / Kagano	5 015 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Construction of two classrooms for Karambi Secondary School	2009	Nyamasheke / Karambi	7 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Supply solar electricity in Ngange	2009	Nyamasheke / Karambi	2 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed

Health Center					
Construction of Tile Factory in Rangiro	2009	Nyamasheke / Rangiro	7 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Support to KAUKI Cooperative for bee products processing	2009	Nyaruguru / Kivu	4 500 000	Agriculture	Completed
Construction fence around beekeeping areas for protection against wildlife KAUKI Cooperative	2009	Nyaruguru / Kivu	1 800 000	Agriculture	completed
Construction of tile factory by Turwanyenyakatsi Cooperative	2009	Nyaruguru / Kivu	5 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Support water supply project by ENTRESEP	2009	Rusizi / Butare	5 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Provide equipment for Bweyeye maternity and 2 cultural troops	2009	Rusizi / Bweyeye	6 167 000	Equipment	Completed
Construction of water tank at Matare	2009	Rusizi /Matare	5 014 000	Infrastructure	Completed

Secondary School					
Construction of dormitory at Inyange Secondary School	2009	Rusizi / Nyakabuye	10 335 000	Infrastructure	Completed
Support construction of 20 houses for poor families	2010	Nyamagabe / Uwinkingi	6 000 000	Infrastructure	On going
Support construction of 20 houses for poor families	2010	Karongi /Twumba	6 000 000	Infrastructure	On going
Construction of Tile Factory	2010	Karongi / Mutuntu	7 806 000	Infrastructure	On going
Support construction of 20 houses for poor families	2010	Rusizi / Bweyeye	6 000 000	Infrastructure	On going
Support Construction of 20 houses in Bweyeye for poor families	2010	Nyaruguru /Ruheru	6 000 000	Infrastructure	On going
Support Construction of 20 houses in Karambi for poor families	2010	Nyamasheke / Karambi	6 000 000	Infrastructure	On going

Construction of 4 classrooms for Bwanama Primary School	2010	Nyamasheke /Cyato	11 000 000	Infrastructure	Not starting
Support completion of the construction of refectory at Rususa Secondary School	2010	Rusizi / Nkungu	12 350 117	Infrastrcuture	Pending.
Support the construction of maize grinding factory	2010	Nyamagabe / Buruhukiro	10 000 000	Infrastructure	Completed

## **b. Annex b: RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS**

### **A. Community Representatives**

#### **1. Where does the mandate to share revenues come from?**

Mutuntu / Karongi: not well known

Bweyeye/ Rusizi: communities need to have ownership on the park and commit to its conservation because they see it as their own asset;

Buruhukiro/ Nyamagabe: RDB's idea and aiming at sensitizing communities for the conservation of the park

Kivu/Nyaruguru: Not well understood, however they think that the RS aims to help beekeepers to increase their production and also to adopt better beekeeping techniques compliant with conservation requirements (i.e. avoid fires etc)

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: RDB has initiated this program

RDB managers: RS Guidelines have been elaborated, and have been in use since 2005; but not yet built into a RS policy or law

#### **2. How does the revenue sharing program work?**

Mutuntu / Karongi: Beneficiaries prepare project and pass it on to Sector (Agronome of the sector) who assesses the relevance of the project re social impact & conservation impact; the agronom transmits the proposal to the District (responsible of cooperatives) who also assesses it and will table the proposal during the RS Committee meeting, in which RDB reps are present. A decision on the funding of project is then taken by consensus

Bweyeye / Rusizi: as above; however some complaints : communities are not informed regularly re the selection process and even the outcome / decision re the project funding...

Buruhukiro / Nyamagabe: as above; however priorities are selected at sector level, but district has a say in the final process of projects ideas to present to RDB

Kivu/Nyaruguru: Not sure; but they did present their proposal to their local authorities who discussed this with RDB officials and helped to secure the RDB support

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: As above, there is RS Committee to select project proposals coming from different districts... it is a tough competition process.

RDB / park managers: RS program is embedded in RDB conservation program; however the program is currently deviated from its primary intended goal of supporting conservation, and is increasingly used as

tool for corporate social responsibility (leaving out the primary objective of supporting conservation of the parks). The tendency now is to give out a fixed amount of the money (an annual envelope) to each district sharing borders with any of the NPs, and these districts have all the responsibility to use that money for whatever good intentions / projects they have, which might even have no conservation relevance. On top of that these projects might not necessarily fulfill the project criteria in accordance to the RS Guidelines; the only condition that currently prevails is that the districts follow the existing procedures in the usage and disbursement of government funds. This tendency is dictated by the intention of RDB to get away of such responsibilities. The question now is to know the future roles of and relevance of the Park RS Committee, which in the past used to be accountable for the selection and monitoring of the RS supported projects, if RS responsibility is now in the hands of the districts and the park does not have a say, especially to make its voice heard in relation to the required support from the local communities to make sure adequate protection is ensured... Ex: RS funds have been used to support some other governments programs such as 9YBE and Fight against Nyakatsi, which would have been otherwise funded... RS is becoming an easy source of funds for districts to source out funding for priority / development programs which do not necessarily have a direct/indirect impact on park conservation, the argument being that this is after all, government money, so it can be used wherever it is most needed. However, this is contrary to one of the RS guideline which stipulates that RS is not meant to replace other government social development programs and its prime objective should rather be to support conservation...

### **3. Are revenues shared every year?**

Mutuntu /Karongi: not sure

Bweyeye / Rusizi: not sure...

Buruhukiro / Nyamagabe: process is annual, but all the projects presented each year do not get funded; it is a tough competition, but some projects get additional support

Kivu/Nyaruguru: Not know, not sure

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: yes

RDB / Park managers: yes

### **4. How is the decision made to distribute revenues for a given year or not?**

Mutuntu / Karongi: Through a meeting called by the RDB and in which authorities at district level are represented; but not the proponent of the project

Bweyeye / Rusizi: through the meeting of the Revenue Sharing Committee

Buruhukiro / Nyamagabe: as above; however beneficiaries are not present, and they do wish so so that they could better provide required explanation than their sector authorities who do not necessarily understand the relevance and meaning of the presented projects...

Kivu/Nyaruguru: as above, how they wish to be part of the decision process

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: RDB takes a decision and informs the beneficiaries /districts

RDB / park managers: the amount shared are calculated out of the revenues of the previous year and is provided into the budget of the actual year. The amount is decided during the annual budget exercise

## **5. How many revenue sharing projects have been done? (since 2005 and/or recent**

Mutuntu / Karongi: just 1 project: this one on tile factory submitted since 2008, but got delayed due to financial procedures

Bweyeye / Rusizi: 4 projects so far: maternity ward; medical equipment; equipment for cultural troupe; fight against nyakatsi (thatched houses)

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: 2 projects : construction of schools? (9YBE); support of the construction of maize factory... however this latter has not yet started since the money was released two years ago; due to delay in the acquisition of land and also the need to expand the project

Kivu/Nyaruguru: Support beekeeping, water sources adduction

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: 2 projects so far: nursery for maracuja [has never been completed due to lack of supervision]; modern tile factory

RDB / park managers: 41 projects so far supported around NNP (see annex...)

## **6. What criteria are used for choosing which projects are funded?**

Mutuntu/ Karongi: Not known

Bweyeye/Rusizi: not aware

Buruhukiro / Nyamagabe: They do look into performance contract (both at sector and district levels); but also they take into account the needs / requirements for the better protection of the park

Kivu/Nyaruguru: Not aware

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: Pertinence of the project re community livelihood and conservation relevance, required budget, benefits to people and conservation of the park

RDB/park managers: several criteria have been devised: (1) project feasibility; (2) project sustainability and impacts; (3) distance/ proximity to the national park; (4) positive and tangible impact on conservation; (5) participation of project beneficiaries; (6) demonstrable benefits to the local population; (7) integration with RDB and district development plans; (8) size of the project

## **7. Who is involved in the decision process?**

Mutuntu/Karongi: Not know

Bweyeye / Rusizi: not sure

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: RS Committee at park level

Kivu/Nyaruguru: RDB and other officials at district

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: RDB and officials from districts

RDB/Parks managers: There is a RS committee instituted at the level of each park, and composed of : (1) Park wardens – Chief Park Warden and Community Conservation Warden; (2) district representative; (3) park partners – NGOs representatives; (4) Local representatives from target area / beneficiaries

## **8. In your opinion, are the right projects chosen?**

Mutuntu / Karongi: Not sure

Bweyeye/Rusizi: can t tell, don t know

Buruhukiro / Nyamagabe: they think the right projects are selected, because these pass through a series of checks at different levels (from communities to district through the sector before consensus in RDB's RS led meeting

Kivu/Nyaruguru: yes, however many more small projects could be selected which are to have positive impacts on park conservation

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: Yes, because of apparent rigorous selection process, however more transparency is needed

RDB/Parks managers: in the past the selection of project used to follow a rigorous process, starting from level of beneficiaries themselves up to the level of the Park RS Committee. Nowadays, this process has been flawed as above described... because the process is now handled by the district as the district is now responsible for the RS funds usage and disbursement.

## **9. How much money has been distributed?**

Mutuntu/Karongi: 4mio out of 7mio required to complete the project

Bweyeye/Rusizi: don't know, RDB should tell

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: initial installment for the maize project : 10mio (construction, buying machineries etc), but 6 mio still pending

Kivu/Nyaruguru: 6.3mio for beekeeping support (equipment, fencing of the apiary)

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: 8 mio for maracuja nursery; 7mio for modern tile factory

RDB / Park managers: 41 supported projects are located in Nyungwe area, totalizing the amount of RWF 295 779 026, equivalent to 28.4% of the total disbursement by RDB.

#### **10. What percentage of collected fees are shared?**

Mutuntu/ Karongi: not known

Bweyeye/ Rusizi: heard about a %, but not sure what it is

Buruhukiro/ Nyamagabe: They are aware of the 5% of the RDB total park revenues

Kivu/Nyaruguru: not aware of the %

Rangiro/ Nyamasheke: 5%

RDB/Park managers: 5% of the total tourism revenues

#### **11. Which fees are eligible for revenue sharing?**

Mutuntu/Karongi: can't answer, don't know

Bweyeye/Rusizi: not sure, we know it comes from RDB, maybe from tourism or from fines for illegal activities

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: 5% of the RDB total park revenues

Kivu/Nyaruguru: can't tell

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: tourism fees

RDB/Park managers: tourism revenues

#### **12. What do you think the fees should be used for?**

Mutuntu / Karongi: communities do not identify themselves with the project... which is usually an idea of a few "enlightened"; should keep the idea of cooperative, but need for technical capacity building in coop management, business planning, etc.

Bweyeye/Rusizi: project should target the poorest among the communities; today they look into the district/sector priorities; they should also come and listen to us

Buruhukiro / Nyamagabe: projects that are geared toward rural development, that generate benefit for communities in terms of direct income, employment and access to basic services...

Kivu/Nyaruguru: supporting community initiatives aiming at social welfare etc

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: projects that have tangible benefits for communities... ex: need to have system that prevent crop raiding by park's primates; this is a serious issue that needs to be looked urgently

RDB/Park managers: See criteria of projects

### **13. Do people know that projects are funded by parks revenues?**

Mutuntu /Karongi: They get informed through meetings, but can't understand well the reason why for this RS

Bweyeye/Rusizi: Yes, but still do not know well why this; because it is not payment for community contribution in fire fighting

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: yes, they get informed / sensitized through meetings

Kivu/Nyaruguru: yes, the cooperative gets receive RDB visit, but not every member of community is aware of that

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: Yes people are aware, they are informed through community meetings

RDB/Park managers: Not all the people are aware about the RS program, a substantive effort is required to make it more popular and raise more community support for conservation.

### **14. Do local people benefit from the RS projects?**

Mutuntu / Karongi: benefit not yet visible, as the project is not yet complete... however, no clear vision of how the brick factory is going to be managed so as it could generate tangible benefits

Bweyeye/Rusizi: yes projects do contribute to increase the community welfare in general, but do not take into account individual benefits

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: Not yet , because project has not yet started

Kivu/Nyaruguru: benefits are still low

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: yes, mainly the members of the cooperatives, however the community members get easily access to roofing material as they need

RDB/Park managers: a fraction of surrounding community do benefit from RS, there is need to make sure that the needs of poorest of the poor are taken into consideration by the RS program, as the latter are the most affected and also themselves affect park protection.

**15. How much do people benefit? (quantify if possible); Not at all (1); Very little (2); Some benefit (3); Reasonable benefit (4); A lot of benefits (5)**

Mutuntu: Not yet clear

Bweyeye/Rusizi: some benefit

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: reasonable benefits are expected

Kivu/Nyarugugu: Some benefits

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: reasonable benefits

RDB/park managers: just some benefits

**16. In your opinion, is the benefit enough to improve conservation attitudes and behaviors?**

Mutuntu/Karongi: Not at all; poverty is huge in this part of the country, any additional support is welcome

Bweyeye/Rusizi: As above

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: Not sure because the needs are hugely important, and not sure for the benefits to spread to all the communities around...

Kivu/Nyaruguru: the beekeeping revenues do not yet cover most of their basic needs in such a way that they cannot live exclusively on beekeeping, they still need agriculture etc... and still see the park as potential land to expand agricultural opportunities...

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: yes for the immediate beneficiaries; however other people still look at the park as source of problem due to the crop raiding issue which should be addressed as quickly as possible.

RDB/Park managers: the program is still in its infancy, it has not yet affected many among the communities living around NNP, therefore its benefits are not yet significant to affect livelihood and also help changing the community attitude and behaviors to conservation.

**B. Interviews with RS beneficiaries (Group discussion)**

**1. Has the park been responsible for providing any projects in or near your village?**

Bweyeye / Rusizi: yes, 8 + 32 houses constructed with the support from park

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: yes, maize factory; community are proud of this project

Mutuntu/Karongi: yes, construction of modern tile factory

Kivu/Nyaruguru: yes, supported their cooperative in acquiring modern beehives, construction of modern apiary and honey collection, and fencing the apiary

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: yes, construction of modern tile factory owned by the local cooperative COOTRA

**2. How long has this project been here?**

Bweyeye / Rusizi: Since 2011

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: the project was accepted in 2011, but has not yet taken off the ground due to difficulties in acquiring the land and also the unavailability of electrical power

Mutuntu/Karongi: started in 2008, but was delayed for unknown reasons (beneficiaries could not explain)

Kivu/Nyaruguru: RS support was received in 2007

Rangiro / Nyamasheke: just over one year

**3. In your estimation, how many people (children in the case of the project being a school) use this project?**

Bweyeye/Rusizi: 8 families (around 45 persons) + 25 families (120 persons)

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: many communities from the surrounding sectors (Nkomane, Gatere, Uwinkingi, Buruhukiro, Kitabi...) who grow maize are going to benefit through value addition on their maize produce (this is the selected crop for all that region)

Mutuntu/Karongi: 60 members of the cooperatives; however the project is expected to have wider impact on communities around in providing roofing material and therefore improving their livelihoods

Kivu/Nyaruguru: 32 KAUKI cooperative members, plus 318 employees

Rangiro / Nyamasheke: the factory provided tiles to different people including 20 members of the cooperative which owns the factory; more than 50 communities and traders who bought the tiles, schools roof material etc.

**4. In your estimation, from how far away do people (children) travel to use this project?**

Bweyeye/Rusizi: not relevant (they already live in those houses)

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: the facility is going to serve communities up to at least 40km radius; however the cooperative is planning to buy a truck to help in maize transportation

Mutuntu/Karongi: about 800m from the nearest community

Kivu/Nyaruguru: around 2km to the nearest village

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: people do travel from as far as 10km to get the tiles produced by the factory

**5. Who provided the funds to build this project?**

Bweyeye/Rusizi: RDB through RS; but they were not fully aware of the RS (confused it with other government programs regarding fighting the nyakatsi)

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: RDB through RS, however the district paid expert to fine tune the proposal. There is more expertise needed for Cooperative action and business plans

Mutuntu/Karongi: RDB provided 7mio, which passes through district; however they do not know how much has so far been utilized and yet the works seem to be on stand... they expect district to provide necessary funds until it is complete... ownership for the facility: district? Sector? Cooperative? not clear)

Kivu/Nyaruguru: RDB provided financial support, district provided expertise in drafting the project concept

Rangiro/Ntamasheke: RDB through its RS programme

**6. Are you aware that there is a program that shares a percentage of the entrance fees to Nyungwe National Park with local communities to build projects like this?**

Bweyeye/Rusizi: yes, they are aware, they know about the construction of the maternity ward that was previously constructed by the then ORTPN (now RDB)

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: Yes they know

Mutuntu/Karongi: they are not aware of the RS per se, they knew only that the support came from RDB, that's all.

Kivu/Nyaruguru: yes, they are aware

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: Yes, sure

**7. (if participants knew the funds were from the park) Has the provision of this project changed: Your attitudes towards the park? Your conservation behavior towards the park?**

Bweyeye/Rusizi: Yes, they assured that they used to go poaching in the park, and they have changed since then as now they can see tangible other bigger benefits that the park is able to provide; they also participate now eagerly to fight fires when they break out in the forest; they also have been sensitized about the value and importance of the park

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: no change yet, as the project has not yet started; however need to make advocacy in showing the linkage between the existence of the project / facility with the presence of the park as their neighbor; however they have a very active ANICO system, who have created a cooperative and have even opened a bank account

Mutuntu/Karongi: have attended sensitization meetings; not the project as its impacts are yet to be seen

Kivu/Nyaruguru: yes, they are no longer rearing the bees inside the park (they have taken their bee hives outside the park), they share information in relation to the park and its potential threats such as fire etc. They take lead in community meetings to explain to their fellows re the benefits of the park and the need for continual conservation

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: yes they now understand better the importance of the park, they no longer kill animals for poaching and even for those that are problem animal (crop raiders); 3 coop members who used to be poachers, and would go tree cutting have now abandoned such malpractices; they now talk openly about the benefits of the parks through community meetings

**8. (if participants did not know that the project was funded by the park) Do you believe knowledge that the project was paid for by the park would change: Your attitudes towards the park? Your conservation behavior towards the park?**

Bweyeye/Rusizi: Not relevant

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: not relevant

Mutuntu/Karongi: not sure... need to see those benefits

Kivu/Nyaruguru: not sure...

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: not sure...

**9. Are there any disadvantages caused by living this close to the park? If yes, what are the disadvantages?**

Bweyeye/Rusizi: yes primates, mainly baboons raiding regularly crops belonging to this community

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: yes, mainly primates (l'hoesti, baboons, blue monkeys), warthog and cephalophes,

Mutuntu/Karongi: yes, baboons digging out potatoes; they have to set up crop guarding system and pay for it

Kivu/Nyaruguru: yes, presence of primates such as baboons (crop raiding) and chimpanzees (beehive destruction in search of honey); some types of rodents that destroy beehives...

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: yes, crop raiding is major problem caused by primates such as baboons, velvet monkeys etc. also one young boy has been injured by a park animal (monkey)

**10. Are there any advantages caused by living this close to the park? If yes, what are the advantages?**

Bweyeye/Rusizi: yes, these houses were constructed because this community was living close to the park

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: yes, good weather, permanent springs, bees and their role in plant fecundation etc...

Mutuntu/Karongi: good climate conditions to grow different crops: potatoes, maize,

Kivu/Nyaruguru: RS projects, clean water provision, high quality honey, good and strong health...

Rangiro/Nyamasheke: yes, good climate conditions, park related knowledge, RS etc.

**11. In your opinion, are these disadvantages off-set by provision of projects like this one? (try to gauge perceived value of this project)**

Bweyeye/Rusizi: well not really because the crop raiding is a huge issue which compounds indeed the problem of poverty among the community in that area

Buruhukiro/Nyamagabe: not for now, however there is hope that this will be the case once the project /facility is complete and operational

Mutuntu/Karongi: not sure, need to see the project operating and see the amount of benefits they get out

Kivu/Nyaruguru: not yet, the damages by wild animals are still huge and are major cause of conflicts in this area.

Rangiro / Nyamasheke: as above... however they have set up guarding system

*Any other notes:*

KAUKI of Kivu/ Nyaruguru complained about the delay in the release of the funds that pass through the district account... they do not have any control whatsoever and fear that the funds could be diverted into other different usages...

COOTRA Cooperative of Rangiro / Nyamasheke suggest to organise exchange events between RS beneficiaries from different areas of the park